

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-10 are pending in this Application.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, and 10 are currently amended. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-10 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,895,382 (hereinafter “Srinivasan”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,119,102 (hereinafter “Rush”).

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-10 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Srinivasan in view of Rush. Applicants respectfully submit that Srinivasan and Rush, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-10. These differences, along with other difference, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1-10 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Amended claim 1 recites the limitation that a workflow corresponding to a selected business process is launched for arriving at a make or buy decision. As recited, launching the workflow includes configuring one or more computers to enforce the selected business process. As further recited, information configured for displaying a comparison between quantifications of the make decision and the buy decision is generated based on information obtained through enforcement of the selected business process through the workflow. As recited, enforcement of the selected business process through the workflow includes receiving the obtained information at the one or more computers systems in response to

performing one or more actions according to a set of predetermined rules associated with the workflow.

Applicants respectfully submit that Srinivasan and Rush, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest enforcement of a selected business process through the recited workflow and generating information configured for displaying a comparison between quantifications of the make decision and the buy decision as recited in claim 1. Paragraph [0019] of the Application discloses that a workflow may be thought of as the automated enforcement of a business process. As further discussed, during the workflow actions are performed according to a predetermined set of procedural rules. FIG. 1 illustrates one exemplary workflow. FIG. 2 displays a chart quantifying aspects of the buy or make decisions. (see Paragraph [0026],[0028] where chart 204 quantifies opportunity cost of buying vs cost of manufacturing).

Srinivasan and Rush, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest generating information configured for displaying a comparison between quantifications of the make decision and the buy decision based on information obtained through enforcement of the selected business process through the workflow as recited in amended claim 1. None of FIGS. 3-16 or Tables 1-3 of Srinivasan provide such a comparison between quantifications of the make decision and the buy decision based on information obtained through enforcement of the selected business process through the workflow as recited in amended claim 1.

Srinivasan and Rush, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest receiving the obtained information in response to performing one or more actions according to a set of predetermined rules associated with the workflow as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Srinivasan and Rush fail to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in amended claim 1. Applicants further respectfully submit that none of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Srinivasan and Rush, and thus, amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 9 and 10 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others.

Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims that depend directly and/or indirectly from independent claim 1 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

Appl. No. 10/816,325  
Amdt. dated January 12, 2010  
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure  
Examining Group 3624

PATENT

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SFP:lls  
62336786 v1